

evening who had completed their day's training.

As the apprehension was made, it was disclosed that this individual had actually entered onto the base, memorized the roads and the buildings on the base, and had actually drawn a map to provide to the other members of the cell who would take part in the attack.

This provision that's in this en bloc amendment would provide some extra tools for base commanders to be sure that people who enter onto Federal installations would have a background check done through the FBI, as well as through the Department of Homeland Security where immigration records are kept.

I want to thank Mr. ANDREWS for his high level of cooperation on this, and also to express my thanks to the chairman for agreeing to make this provision part of this en bloc amendment.

I understand there are some questions about it. Mr. ANDREWS and I, I won't speak for him, as we work through this, between now and the time we get a conference report, there may be some changes that are necessary. The last thing we want to do is to unduly restrict civilian activities, legitimate civilian activities on and around military bases.

So I look forward to working with the chairman, the ranking member and Mr. ANDREWS and others who may be interested to make sure that we do not do something that is harmful to morale or stymies activities on or around military bases.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY).

Mr. BOUSTANY. I thank the ranking member.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the amendment that we have is plain and simple. It's to protect the privacy of America's fallen heroes and their families.

Along with my colleague and friend from Oklahoma, Congressman BOREN, I introduced this measure at the request of mothers of Marine Private David Burrige and Army Corporal Joseph Thibodeaux, both of Lafayette, Louisiana, who lost their lives in Iraq in September of 2004. While still recovering from the shock and the loss of their children, these mothers were appalled to discover the names of their sons had been printed on the back of T-shirts and sold for profit.

This amendment before us today requires that our military men and women, or their surviving relatives, be the sole decisionmaker in consenting to use their name or image for commercial purposes. While there is no way to ever express in words the significance of their sacrifice, we have a duty to honor and protect their memories and, most importantly, their rights.

No one can dispute that Americans, and particularly Members of this body, have fundamental differences over the war in Iraq. All Americans certainly

have a right to express these views in public, but Americans, and particularly our fallen heroes and their families, also have a right to protect their names and images from commercial exploitation. This amendment accomplishes just that.

I want to thank Chairman SKELTON, our Ranking Member HUNTER, as well as the Rules Committee for allowing this amendment to come to the floor.

I urge our colleagues to support this nonpartisan legislation.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to a member of the Armed Services Committee, my friend from Oklahoma (Mr. BOREN).

Mr. BOREN. Thank you, Mr. SKELTON. I also want to thank our colleague from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY) and our ranking member, Mr. DUNCAN HUNTER.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment prohibits the commercial use of our troops' names and images without permission.

The need for this protection was first brought to my attention by Judy Vincent, a constituent who lost her son, Marine Corporal Scott Vincent, to a suicide bomber in Fallujah in April of 2004. Since that time, Judy has found Internet vendors using the name and likeness of her son and other fallen soldiers on their merchandise.

Bills were signed into law in Oklahoma and Louisiana last year to address this abuse, but Judy's story made it clear that there were hundreds, perhaps thousands of American families out there facing the same problem, and only a Federal law will offer the protection that they deserve.

This amendment isn't about financial restitution, stifling debate on the war, even putting people in prison. It's about respecting the privacy of our soldiers and their families. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my colleague and friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ALTMIRE).

Mr. ALTMIRE. Mr. Chairman, ongoing military engagements and extended deployments impact not only our troops, but also the families of our brave men and women in uniform. Military families are struggling to balance everything from their financial obligations to child care responsibilities.

I offer this amendment to address this and provide military families with some relief. This amendment allows the immediate family of military personnel to use Family Medical Leave Act time for issues directly arising from deployment and extended deployments.

The wife of a recently deployed military servicemember could use the Family Medical Leave Act to arrange for child care. The husband of a servicemember could use the Family Medical Leave Act to attend predeployment briefings and family support sessions.

The parents of a deployed servicemember could take Family Med-

ical Leave Act time to see their raised child off or welcome them back home.

This amendment does not expand eligibility to employees not already covered by the Family Medical Leave Act.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, how much time do we have on this?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California has 5 remaining minutes, and the gentleman from Missouri has 6½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HUNTER. Thank you. I just wanted to say that we strongly support this amendment on this side. We think it's an excellent amendment. We thank both of the authors, the gentleman from Louisiana and the gentleman from Oklahoma, for bringing this amendment to us. We support it very strongly.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of our time.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI).

□ 1930

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank Chairman SKELTON and Ranking Member HUNTER for placing this amendment en bloc. It is a bipartisan amendment that I offered along with Mr. INGLIS, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. KIRK.

This amendment simply requires the Department of Defense, where feasible, to begin using high-efficiency light bulbs whenever a light bulb is installed. Currently, compact fluorescent light bulbs, known as CFLs, are the most energy efficient. CFLs use about 75 percent less energy than standard bulbs, last 8 to 10 times longer and can save over \$74 over the lifetime of a single bulb.

When you consider that the DOD has over 240,000 buildings in the U.S. alone, it is clear that this requirement is a practical way to make significant progress in lowering energy consumption, reducing greenhouse gas emissions, and promoting energy independence while at the same time saving millions of taxpayer dollars.

At a time when we struggle with a new energy plan, this is a rare win-win opportunity, and I ask for your support.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition to this, although I do not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from California reclaims the time that he yielded back.

There was no objection.

Mr. HUNTER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. That's exactly what I wanted to do.

I just wanted to get on the record that I support this amendment very strongly, the idea of saving energy. I would hope that the gentleman would agree that, wherever possible, the energy-saving devices, these light bulbs, should be made in the United States.